



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/521,282	03/07/2000	Jacques Belissent	SUNIP602	9227

22434 7590 02/10/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP  
P.O. BOX 778  
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

DELGADO, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/521,282

Applicant(s)

BELISSENT ET AL

Examiner

Michael S. A. Delgado

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,6,7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claim 1-5, 11-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,226,751 by Arrow et al.

In claim 1 Arrow teaches about a method for defining a virtual domain in an electronic messaging system, comprising (Fig 1):

defining a virtual domain node corresponding to a real domain name server in a hierarchically organized directory (Col 3, lines 30-35), (Fig 1); and

associating a plurality of virtual domain attributes to the virtual domain node (Col 9, lines 20-35).

For claim 2, Arrow teaches about a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the plurality of virtual domain attributes include a designated virtual domain administrator, a designated virtual domain postmaster, a state of the virtual domain, and a set of allowed services for the virtual domain (Fig 7).

In claim 3, Arrow teaches about a method as recited in claim 2, wherein the state of the virtual domain node is selected from the list comprising: active, inactive (or suspended), and deleted (Col 8, lines 50-60).

For claim 4, Arrow teaches about a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the hierarchically organized directory is a tree-based hierarchy (Fig 6, 610).

In claim 5, Arrow teaches about a method as recited in claim 4, wherein the tree based hierarchy is a standard based directory information tree (DIT) that includes a plurality of directory entries each of which is associated with a higher level (parent) directory entry (Fig 6, 610).

In claim 11, Arrow teaches about a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the electronic messaging system is an email messaging system (Col 6, lines 55-65).

For claim 12, Arrow teaches about a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the electronic messaging system is a voicemail messaging system (Col 6, lines 55-65).

For claim 14, Arrow teaches about a computer-readable medium containing programming instructions for defining a virtual domain in an electronic messaging system, the

Art Unit: 2143

computer-readable medium comprising computer program code devices configured to cause a computer to execute the operations of (Fig 1):

defining a virtual domain node corresponding to a real (non-virtual) domain in a hierarchically organized directory (Col 3, lines 30-35), (Fig 1); and

associating a plurality of virtual domain attributes to the virtual domain node (Col 9, lines 20-35).

In claim 15, Arrow teaches about a computer-readable medium containing programming instructions for defining a virtual domain in an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 10, wherein the plurality of virtual domain attributes include a designated virtual domain administrator, a designated virtual domain postmaster, a state of the virtual domain, and a set of allowed services for the virtual domain and wherein the state of the virtual domain node is selected from the list comprising (Fig 7): active, inactive (or suspended), and deleted (Col 8, lines 50-60).

For claim 16, Arrow teaches about a computer-readable medium containing programming instructions for defining a virtual domain in an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 15, the computer-readable medium further comprising computer program code devices configured to cause a computer to execute the operations of (Fig 4): defining a routing table based upon the segmented name space, wherein the routing table is used by a transfer agent to direct an appropriately addressed email message to a receiving user in the virtual domain (Col 3, lines 30-35).

In claim 17, Arrow teaches about a computer-readable medium containing programming instructions for defining a virtual domain in an electronic messaging system as recited in claim

Art Unit: 2143

16, the computer-readable medium further comprising computer program code devices configured to cause a computer to execute the operations of (Fig4, 404):

initially resolving a user name during a user name search operation at the higher hierarchical level and subsequently at the first hierarchical level such that in a multi-domain environment the search operation is performed as if the user name was part of a flat name space (Col 11, lines 35-45).

For claim 18, Arrow teaches about an electronic messaging system having a main host computer for transferring an incoming message between a sending subscriber and a receiving subscriber having an associated unique user name, comprising (Fig 1):

a messaging server coupled to the host computer arranged to receive the incoming message from the sending subscriber and arranged to forward the message to the receiving subscriber based upon the receiving subscriber's user name (Col 9, lines 10-35), (Fig 1);

a hierarchically organized directory coupled to the messaging server arranged to define a virtual domain node corresponding to a real (non-virtual) domain having associated with it a plurality of virtual domain attributes to the virtual domain node (Col 3, lines 30-35), (Fig 1);

In claim 19, Arrow teaches about an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 18, wherein the plurality of virtual domain attributes include a designated virtual domain administrator, a designated virtual domain postmaster, a state of the virtual domain, and a set of allowed services for the virtual domain (Fig 7).

For claim 20, Arrow teaches about an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 19, wherein the state of the virtual domain node is selected from the list comprising: active, inactive (or suspended), and deleted (Col 8, lines 50-60).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claim 6-10, 13 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,226,751 by Arrow et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,366,950 by Scheussler et al.

In claim 6, Arrow teaches about a directory database but fails to disclosed the limitation where the directory takes the form of a segmented name space. Scheussler teaches about a method in which the directory takes the form of a segmented name space (Col 6, lines 25-30).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for some one of ordinary skill to organize a translation database in a directory structure. A directory structure allows one the ability to organize complex database in to manageable parts. In this way, the time taken to traverse and maintain the database is reduce to a minimum.

In claim 7, a method as recited in claim 6, wherein the segmented name space includes a segmented name associated with a user that is segmented in such a way that the user is uniquely

Art Unit: 2143

identified by a unique user name at a first hierarchical level and an associated domain name at a higher hierarchical level (Covered in claim 6).

For claim 8, a method as recited in claim 7, wherein during a user name search operation, the user name is initially resolved at the higher hierarchical level and subsequently at the first hierarchical level such that in a multi-domain environment the search operation is performed as if the user name was part of a flat name space (Covered in claim 6).

In claim 9, Arrow teaches about a method as recited in claim 8 further comprising:

defining a routing table based upon the segmented name space, wherein the routing table is used by a transfer agent to direct an appropriately addressed email message to a receiving user in the virtual domain (Col 6, lines 30-50).

For claim 10, Arrow teaches about a method as recited in claim 9, wherein the segmented name space is based upon the most direct path from the user name to the highest connected hierarchical level in the directory (Col 8, lines 50-60).

In claim 13, Arrow teaches about a directory database but fails to disclosed the limitation where the directory is a standard based directory is an LDAP based directory. Scheussler teaches about a method in which the directory takes the form of a standard based directory is an LDAP based directory (Col 9, lines 28-35).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for some one of ordinary skill to use LDAP to reduce the overhead that is required to store information. The LDAP provides a means where the database and its attributes can be stored and retrieved with less overhead when compares to conventional directory. This allows smaller storage space and reduces cost for memory.



In claim 21, an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 20, wherein the hierarchically organized directory is an LDAP based directory information tree (DIT) that includes a plurality of directory entries each of which is associated with a higher level (parent) directory entry and wherein the directory takes the form of a segmented name space (Covered in claims 6 & 13).

For claim 22, Arrow teaches about an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 21, wherein the user name is segmented in such a way that the user is uniquely identified by a unique userid at a first hierarchical level and an associated domain name at a higher hierarchical level (Col 9, lines 25-35).

In claim 23, Arrow teaches about an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 22, wherein in order for the messaging server to forward the email message to the receiving subscriber, the messaging server executes a user name search operation (Col 7, lines 55-67).

For claim 24, an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 23, wherein the user name search operation comprises:

initially resolving the user name at a highest hierarchical level and subsequently at a lowest hierarchical level in such a way that when the name search operation is executed in a multi-domain environment, the search operation is performed as if the user name was part of a flat name space (Covered in claim 6).

In claim 25, Arrow teaches about an electronic messaging system as recited in claim 24, wherein the messaging server further includes:

Art Unit: 2143

a routing table defined by the directory based upon the resolved receiving subscriber's user name that defines a path by which the email message is passed from the sending subscriber to the receiving subscriber (Col 8, lines 50-60); and

a transfer agent arranged to direct the email message from the sending subscriber to the receiving subscriber as defined by the routing table (Fig 5).

### *Conclusion*

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 6,434,600 by Waite et al teaches about a method and system for securely delivering electronic mail to host having dynamic address.

US Patent No. 5,930,474 by Dunwoth et al teaches about an internet organizer for accessing geographically and topically based information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael S. A. Delgado whose telephone number is 703-305-8057. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4.30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/521,282

Page 10

Art Unit: 2143



MD

January 31, 2003

  
**DAVID WILEY**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**